

The FCC would better use its power to police corporate use of public airways to further their own ends illegally, as in the Sinclair case, and political use of airways to promulgate political action based on outright lying, as in Fox news and the corporate supporters of the untruths of the Bush administration that are coming at us from so many media levels people think "it must be true."

I am far less concerned about the effect of dirty words on our children and our populace than I am about corporate adventuring leading to the propagation of policy based on lies and the resulting diminution of individual freedom and liberty justified by the scare tactics of the Bush administration.

If the FCC were to stop the consistent lying by the Bush administration that is resulting in all manner of terrible results and loss of life and freedom, such as the unending and unresolvable war in Iraq, Abu Graib, and the incredible mistreatment of citizens of the US and the world, that would be an appropriate use of the FCC to "safeguard the public."

Sinclair Broadcasting's decision to force their stations to air an anti-Kerry documentary days before the election is a clear example of the dangers of media consolidation.

Sinclair uses the public airwaves free of charge, and is obligated by law to serve the public interest. But when large companies control the airwaves, we get more of what's good for the bottom line and less of what we need for our democracy. Instead of something produced at "News Central" far away, it's more important that we see real people from our own communities and more substantive news about issues that matter.

Sinclair's actions show why we need to strengthen media ownership rules, not weaken them. They show why the license renewal process needs to involve more than a returned postcard. Thank you.